

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated June 5, 2007 in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0174831 (“*Yi*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,504 (“*Dent*”) and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0002366 (“*Cromer*”); 2) rejected claims 8, 10-12 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yi* in view of *Cromer*; and 3) rejected claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cromer*.

Based on the arguments contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 13-18 as being anticipated by *Cromer*. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236.

Cromer fails to teach “configuring a device to interpret read/write commands having a non-reduced length” and “configuring the device to interpret read/write commands having a reduced length if the power consumption parameter exists” as is required in claim 13. The Examiner seems to be misinterpreting either *Cromer* or the claimed limitation. Claim 13 involves interpreting read/write commands having a reduced length where the length is measured in number of data bits. In contrast, *Cromer* involves reducing the speed of data transmission where the speed is measured in frequency of symbol transmission (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0014]). The frequency of symbol transmission in *Cromer* has nothing to do with read/write commands having a reduced length (*i.e.*, a reduced number of data bits) as in claim 13. In other words, changing the frequency of symbol transmission as in *Cromer* does not reduce the number of bits in a read/write command. Further, changing the frequency of symbol transmission as in

Cromer does not configure a device to interpret a read/write command having a reduced length as is required in claim 13. For at least these reason, claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Cromer*.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 as being unpatentable over *Yi* in view of *Dent* and *Cromer*. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion of motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art must teach or suggest "all the claim limitations" (MPEP 2143). "The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure." *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

With respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. The Examiner recognizes that *Yi* and *Dent* fail to teach Applicant's claimed "fewer bits are serially transferred between the master device and the slave device for reads and writes in the indirect memory addressing mode than for reads and writes in the direct memory addressing mode", but argues *Cromer* teaches this limitation. However, *Cromer* does not teach fewer bits are transferred as is required in claim 1. In *Cromer*, reducing the speed of data transmission delays but does not reduce the number of bits being transferred. Specifically, *Cromer* states "reducing the symbol transmission rate may result in longer transmission times to transmit the same amount of information..." (paragraph [0014]). A longer transmission time is not the same as reducing the total amount of bits being transferred for reads and writes as is required in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the *Yi*, *Dent* and *Cromer*.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 10-12 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yi* in view of *Cromer*. With respect to claim 8, the cited

references do not teach all of the claimed limitations as is required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Examiner recognizes that Yi does not teach Applicant's claimed "the processor and the slave device are configurable to communicate in multiple modes, each mode being associated with a different read/write command length", but argues *Cromer* teaches this limitation. *Cromer* does not teach different read/write commands lengths for different modes. The Examiner seems to be misinterpreting either *Cromer* or the claimed limitation. Claim 8 involves modes with different read/write command lengths where length is measured in number of data bits. In contrast, *Cromer* involves reducing the speed of data transmission where the speed is measured in frequency of symbol transmission (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0014]). Changing the frequency of symbol transmission as in *Cromer* has nothing to do with different read/write command lengths (*i.e.*, commands having different numbers of data bits) as in claim 8. As previously noted, *Cromer* states "reducing the symbol transmission rate may result in longer transmission times to transmit the same amount of information..." (paragraph [0014]). A longer transmission time as in *Cromer* is not the same as changing the amount of bits in a read/write command as is required in claim 8. For at least these reasons, claim 8 and its dependent claims are allowable over the *Yi* and *Cromer*.

With respect to claim 19, the cited references do not teach all of the claimed limitations as is required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claim 19, in part, requires "means for conveying a "not busy" signal from the slave device to the master device during the first and second modes, the "not busy" signal having fewer bits in the second mode than in the first mode." *Yi* and *Cromer*, considered individually or together, fail to teach or suggest this limitation. As previously explained, *Cromer* changes the speed of data transmission, but does not affect the total number of bits being transmitted. For at least these reasons, claim 19 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Yi* and *Cromer*.

CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant hereby petitions for any time extensions that are necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned. In the event that additional fees related to this Amendment, or other transactions in this case, are required (including fees for net addition of claims and for time extension), the Examiner is authorized to charge Texas Instruments Incorporated's Deposit Account No. 20-0668 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan D. Christenson/

Alan D. Christenson

PTO Reg. No. 54,036

Conley Rose, P.C.

(713) 238-8000 (Phone)

(713) 238-8008 (Fax)

AGENT FOR APPLICANT